

The 18th January, 1972

No. DOL/HR/72/381.—The Government of Haryana is pleased to make the following rules further to amend the rules for agency of Haryana State Lotteries published,—*vide* Notification No. FD/DOL/68/ST (1.3), dated 4th September, 1968 as amended from time to time as follows, namely :—

1. These rules may be called the Rules for Agency of Haryana State Lotteries (Amendment Rules).
2. For Rule 7 of the Rules for Agency of Haryana State Lotteries, the following shall be substituted, namely :

Additional Commission to the Agents will be allowed as follows.

Ten percent in cases where purchase of tickets made by an agent for the draw exceeds 10,000 tickets.

3. This amendment will be effective for purchases made by agents during the 33rd Draw.

The 19th January, 1972

No. DOL/HR/72/454.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to select the following persons as Judges for the supervision of the 32nd Draw to be held on 20th January, 1972 :—

1. Shri H. L. Gugnani, I.A.S.,
Deputy Secretary to Govt., Haryana,
Revenue Department.
2. Shri S. K. Sen Gupta,
Senior Deputy Accountant-General,
Punjab, Chandigarh.
3. Mrs. Hardip Kaur,
Income-tax Officer,
Chandigarh.
4. Shri K. C. Gupta,
Economic & Statistical Adviser to
Government, Haryana, Chandigarh.
5. Mrs. D. S. Tewaria,
House No. 271, Sector 10-A,
Chandigarh.
6. Shri Murari Singh, H.C.S. (Retd),
Officer on Special Duty,
Haryana Marketing Federation Board,
Chandigarh.

H. K. JAIN,

Director of Lotteries, Haryana and Dy. Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 29th/30th December, 1971

No. 14515-4Lab-71/44929.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Sonepat Textile Mills, Bahalgarh Road Sultanpur (Sonepat) :—

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 146 of 1971

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI SHRI RAM c/o GENERAL WORKERS UNION, SONEPAT
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SONEPAT TEXTILE MILLS, BAHALGARH ROAD
SULTANPUR (SONEPAT)

Present :

Nemo for the workman.

Shri Rajinder Parshad for the management.

AWARD

The workman Shri Shri Ram was in the service of M/s Sonepat Textile Mills, Bahalgarh Road, Sultanpur (Sonepat). His services are said to have been wrongfully terminated by the management and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. Accordingly, the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Court for adjudication,—*vide Government Gazette* notification No. ID/RK/209-A, dated 2nd August, 1971 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Shri Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties for 5th October, 1971. On the date fixed nobody was present on behalf of the workman although the registered notice sent to the General Workers Union was served on Shri M. S. Rathi. The management filed their written statement and pleaded that the applicant was employed only as a Helper on temporary basis on 2nd February, 1970 and in the month of May, he was put to work as a helper on the oil fired boiler. It was pleaded that the oil fired boiler proved to be uneconomical and so it was decided to change over to coal firing and it was decided to pay Rs. 4.50 per day to the workman Shri Shri Ram. It is further pleaded that the workman could not work on the coal fired boiler and he voluntarily left the job on 6th August, 1970 and received his dues. The pleadings of the management gave rise to the following issues :—

1. “Whether the workman voluntarily left the job on 6th August, 1970 and he was paid his dues in full and final settlement ?
2. Whether the termination of the services of the workman was justified because he was working in a temporary capacity ?
3. If the above issues are found in favour of the workman whether the termination of the services of the workman Shri Shri Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The case was adjourned to 23rd November, 1971 for evidence. On the date fixed again nobody appeared on behalf of the workman. Shri Rajinder Parshad was present on behalf of the management and his evidence was recorded. It is satisfactorily established by his evidence that the workman was appointed on temporary basis and he left his service voluntarily on 6th August, 1970. I, therefore, hold that the termination of services of the workman was justified and he is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated 20th December, 1971.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana.
Rohtak.

No. 2509, dated Rohtak, the 21st December, 1971

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

The 13th/14th January, 1972

No. 336-4Lab-72/1887.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officers, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Globe Steels, Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 118 of 1971

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI RAMJI LAL AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S GLOBE STEELS,
BALLABGARH

Present :—

Nemo for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide Government Gazette* Notification No. ID/FD/53-K-71/, dated 8th July, 1971.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ramji Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties. 15th November, 1971 was fixed for filing the statement of claim. A statement of claim under the signatures of the representative of the workman was filed on 27th October, 1971. However, on the date fixed the representative of the workman made a statement that he had no instructions from the workman. On the next day the workman himself appeared and made an application that his representative never informed him of the date fixed in his case although he was coming off and on but could not contact his representative. I am afraid it is not possible to re-open the case because the representative of the workman never wanted any adjournment of the case on the ground that he could not contact the workmen. In the order of reference the address of the workman is only through his authorised representative and, therefore, the Court had no means to issue the notice of the case indirectly to the workman. Notice could only be issued to the representative who made a statement on the date fixed that he had no instruction from the workman to proceed further with the case. The reference, must, therefore, be answered in favour of the management by reason of the non-prosecution of the case on behalf of the workmen. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Dated 4th January, 1972.

No. 37, dated Rohtak, the 4th January, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 452-4Lab-72/1995.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Vikaram Industries, 11/7 Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 42 of 1971.

between

THE WORKMAN SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA DEVI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VIKARAM INDUSTRIES 11/7 MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:—Shri Darshan Singh for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma for the management,

AWARD

The following industrial dispute was referred to this Court for adjudication—*vide Gazette* notification No. ID/FD/502-A/, dated the 14th April, 1971.

“Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Shakuntala Devi was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?”

The plea of the management is that the applicant Shrimati Shakuntala Devi was employed in the Chappal Assembly Department and she indulged in activities of slow down and certain other types of objectionable activities. It is alleged that on 27th August, 1970, she behaved in an indecent and objectionable manner with the other workers and the supervisor. Accordingly she was charge-sheeted and a domestic enquiry was held in which her guilt was established.

The only issue which arose from the pleadings of the parties was precisely the same as in the order of reference. The parties were given an opportunity to produce their evidence. Shri Banke Behari Ram Pal, Manager of the respondent concern who held the enquiry against the applicant, has been examined as M. W. I and he has proved the record of the enquiry. In rebuttal the applicant appeared as her own witness in support of the case.

I have carefully considered the evidence produced by the parties and gone through the record of the domestic enquiry. I see no reason to doubt the correctness of the record of the enquiry. It has not been shown that the principles of natural justice were not followed and this enquiry is vitiated in any manner. In my opinion, the termination of services of the workman was justified and she is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,

Dated the 27th December, 1971.

Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak

No. 3, dated Rohtak, the 3rd January, 1972.

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak

No. 446-4Lab-72/1997.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Bharat Cycle Industries, Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 28, 30 and 40 of 1971

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHARAT CYCLE INDUSTRIES, SONEPAT

Present—

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahiya, for the workmen.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

This order will dispose of 3 connected references No. 28, 30 and 40 of 1971. The facts briefly stated are that Sarvshri Kali Ram, Zhanda Singh and Daryao Singh were in the service of M/s. Barat Cycle Industries, Sonepat. Their services were terminated and this gave rise to three industrial disputes which were separately referred to this court for adjudication,—*vide* gazette notifications No. ID/RK/7B-70, dated 19th February, 1971, ID/RK/7-C-70, dated 19th February, 1971, and ID/RK/7A-70, dated 25th February, 1971, respectively. The subject-matter of reference in each case is as under :—

Reference No. 28 of 1971

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kali Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Reference No. 30 of 1971

Whether the termination of services of Shri Zhanda Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Reference No. 40 of 1971

Whether the termination of services of Shri Daryao Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices under registered cover with regard to all the three references were issued to the parties for 26th April, 1971. Shri Rajinder Singh Dahiya was present on behalf of all the three workmen but nobody was present on behalf of the management. The acknowledgement of the notices sent to the management was not received back and it was ordered that fresh notice be issued for 31st May, 1971. An acknowledgement of the notice issued to the management was received through the postal authorities but nobody was present on behalf of the management. The case was, therefore, adjourned to 16th June, 1970, for the evidence of the workmen. On the date fixed the evidence of the workmen was recorded but the scrutiny of the acknowledgement receipt showed that the signatures of the person receiving the notice on behalf of the management was not legible. For the sake of abundant precaution it was ordered that fresh notice be again issued to the management for 26th August, 1971. The acknowledgement of the notice was received for this date. One Shri Bhagwati Parshad who claimed to be the Muneem of the respondent appeared. He did not bring any letter of authority with him. He was directed to obtain a letter of authority and to file a written statement and the case was adjourned to 22nd September, 1971. Shri Bhagwati Parshad appeared on the date fixed but did not produce any letter of authority and nor did he file any written statement. Under these circumstances there was no other alternative but to proceed *ex parte* against the management.

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahiya who had been appearing on behalf of the workmen throughout made a statement that the statements of the workmen which had already been recorded may be read as evidence and he did not wish to produce any further evidence. It is satisfactorily established by the evidence of all the three workmen that the management terminated their services on 25th August, 1970, without giving them any opportunity to show cause. The termination of the services of all the three workmen is thus proved to be not justified and in order and they are entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages. I give my award accordingly. There will be no order as to costs.

Dated 31st December, 1971.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak,

No. 8, dated Rohtak, the 3rd January, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 460-4Lab-72/1999.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Elson Cotton Mills (P) Ltd., Mathura Road, Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 163 of 1971

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI SABIR AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ELSION COTTON MILLS (P) LTD., MATHURA ROAD, BALLABGARH

Present.—

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri Jawala Singh, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID/FD/392-B, dated 9th September, 1971:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sabir was justified and in order? If not; to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties at the address given in the order of reference. The address of the workman as given in the order of reference was simply c/o Shri Bhim Singh Yadav, I-A/90, N.I.T. Faridabad. So the notice to the workman could only be issued at this address and the service of Shri Bhim Singh was effected. On the date fixed, Shri. Bhim Singh Yadav appeared and made a statement that he had no instructions from the workman. He further stated that he had not even given any demand notice on behalf of the workman Shri Sabir and that he did not know his address. Under these circumstances it was not possible to proceed with the case further because this Court has no means of knowing the address of the workman. Since there is no representation on behalf of the workman and he has taken no steps to be represented in this Court and lead evidence in support of his case although the order of the reference has been duly published in the official gazette, I hold that the termination of his services is not proved to be unjustified. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated the 6th January, 1971.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 80, dated Rohtak, the 6th January, 1972.

Forwarded, in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment, Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 457-4Lab-72/2001.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Bharat Cycle Industries, (Regd) F/26-27, Industrial Area, Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK,

Reference No. 79 of 1971

Between

THE WORKMAN SHRI RADHEY SHAM AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHARAT CYCLE INDUSTRIES, (REGD), F/26-27, INDUSTRIAL AREA, SONEPAT,

Present:— Shri Rajinder Singh Dahiya, for the workman.

Name, for the management,

AWARD

The following industrial dispute between the workman Shri Radhey Sham and the management of M/s Bharat Cycle Industries, Sonepat was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/RK/7D-71, dated the 31st May, 1971:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Radhey Sham was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties. Shri Bhagwati Parshad, a Muneem of the respondent company, appeared on behalf of the management on 26th August, 1971. He could not appear on behalf of the management in view of section 36 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. However, in the interest of justice the case was adjourned to 22nd September, 1971, to enable the management to file their written statement and to be present before the Court in accordance with the law. On the date fixed the Muneem again appeared but he did not file any written statement. In view of the provision 36, his presence could not be recognised and the case was adjourned for the evidence of the workman.

The workman has appeared as his own witness in support of his case and has stated that he has been working in the respondent concern as a foreman on Rs. 350 per mensem and that his services were terminated without giving him any opportunity to show cause or holding any enquiry against him. He further says that on 7th November, 1970, the management had called him and warned him as to why he was trying to form the union of the workers. According to the workman his services have been terminated because of his trade union activities. The workman further says that he is unemployed since the termination of his service.

It is satisfactorily proved by the unrebutted evidence of the workman that the termination of his services was not justified and that he is unemployed, since the wrongful termination of his services. He is, therefore, entitled to be re-instated with continuity of service and full back wages. I give my award accordingly. There will be no order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Dated the 5th January, 1972.

No. 83, dated Rohtak the 6th January, 1972

Forwarded in quadyuplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 453-4Lab-72/2003.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s free Wheel India Limited, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No 23 of 1971

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI MADAN LAL C/o SHRI SEWA RAM, 1-B/9—A FARIDABAD
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s FREE WHEEL INDIA LIMITED, FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Madan Lal workman.

Shri D. C. Bhardwaj, for the management.

AWARD

The following dispute has been referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/FD/168-A-70/6129-33, dated 9th February, 1971:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Madan Lal was justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?

The plea of the management is that the workman abandoned his service on 2nd August, 1970, and so his name was struck off in accordance with the rule 13(f) of the Certified Standing Orders of the respondent factory and the workman was duly informed of this fact. Accordingly the following issues were framed:—

1. Whether the workman Shri Madan Lal abandoned the service of the company of his own free will and for this reason the present reference is bad?
2. If the above issue is not proved whether the termination of services of Shri Madan Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Shri S. C. Jain, Manager of the respondent company has appeared as M. W. 1 and has stated that the workman Shri Madan Lal was appointed as helper on 21st September, 1966 and on 2nd August, 1970 he absented himself without any intimation. Shri Jain states that the workman was awaited upto 11th August, 1970, and then his name was struck off and he was duly informed of this fact by registered letter acknowledgement due which was duly delivered to him,—*vide* acknowledgement Exhibit M.W. 1/2. Shri Jain states that previously also the workman was absent on 14th April, 1968 although his leave had been refused. So a letter copy Exhibit M. W. 1/3 was written to him Shri Jain says that the workman absented himself on 9th May, 1968, although his leave had been refused and in this connection a letter Exhibit M. W. 1/4 was written to him. According to the management the workman is habitual absentee and have filed a chart Exhibit M.W. 1/5 to prove this fact. This chart gives the date on which the workman was absent from January, 1970 to August, 1970. According to the chart the workman was absent for 6 days in the month of January, 1970, one day each in the month of February, and March, 5 days in the month of April, 3 days in the month of May, 4 days in the month of June, 8 days in the month of July, and in the month of August, he absented himself from 3rd August, 1970 and his name was struck off. The attendance card Exhibit M.W. 1/6 has also been filed to prove that the workman was absent from 3rd August, 1970. The management have also produced their Time Keeper Shri Krishan Narayan who was examined as M.W. 2. He has also proved the chart Exhibit M.W. 1/5.

The workman in his evidence admits that he was absent from 2nd August, 1970 to 6th August, 1970 but says that he performed his duty on 7th August, 1970 and 8th August 1970 when he went to perform his duty in the third shift the watchman told him that he could not be permitted to enter the gate. He says that the proprietor took away his attendance card on 4th August 1970.

I have carefully considered the evidence of the parties and in my opinion the version of the workman does not appear to be correct. It is really surprising that the workman did not send any letter of protest then the management without any reason refuse to give him duty on 8th August, 1970. The management have proved letter dated 11th August, 1970 Exhibit M. W. 1/1 which was sent to the workman under registered cover. The workman only received this letter but still he did not protest that the contents of this letter were wrong and that he had not abandoned his service but had actually attended to his duty on 7th August, 1970. The workman simply gave a notice of demand on 29th August, 1970 in which there is no mention that he was refused duty on 8th August, 1970. On the contrary the workman had stated that the management were victimising him because of his trade union activities and unemployment has been forced upon him w.e.f. 12th August, 1970. This version is totally different from the version given in the Court, I am, therefore, of the opinion that the termination of the services of the workman was justified and he is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Dated 3rd January, 1972.

No. 1, dated Rohtak, the 3rd January, 1972.

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 459-4Lab-72/2005.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/S Pearl Cycle Industries Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 53 of 1971

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI MANOHAR LAL SHARMA AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s. PEARL CYCLE INDUSTRIES, BALLABGARH

Present:—Shri A. J. S. Chadha, for the workman.

Shri D. C. Bhardwaj, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute between the workman Shri Manohar Lal Sharma and the management of M/s. Pearl Cycle Industries, Ballabgarh was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/FD/46-A/dated 31st May, 1971:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Manohar Lal Sharma was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?.

The workman Shri Manohar Lal Sharma has also made an application under sub-section (2) of section 33-C of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1971, praying that the amount due to him on account of notice pay, retrenchment compensation etc. be computed. The application is numbered as 364 of 1970.

A compromise has been arrived at between the parties by which the workman has relinquished his claim for reinstatement and his claim for the computation of the amount due has been settled. The management have agreed to pay the following amount to the workman in three equal monthly instalments in full and final settlement of all his claim.

1. Unpaid salary for January, 1969	.. Rs 505.25
2. One month notice pay	.. Rs 565.00

3. Leave with wages 36 days	..	Rs 678.00
4. 6 per cent bonus for the year 1969	..	Rs 387.00
5. 4 per cent bonus for the year, 1970	..	Rs 22.60
6. <i>Ex gratia</i> for 37 days	..	Rs 696.83
Total	..	Rs 2855.28

In view of the settlement, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

Dated the 5th January, 1972.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer.
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 81 dated Rohtak the 6th January, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 445-4Lab/72/2007.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Elson Cotton Mills Private Ltd., Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 165 of 1971

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI JAI KARAN SINGH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s. ELSION COTTON MILLS PRIVATE LTD., BALLABGARH.

Present:—

Shri Bhim Singh, for the workman.

Shri Jawala Singh, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/FD/392-C/ dated 9th September, 1971.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Karan Singh was justified and in order ? If not; to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the reference usual notice were issued to the parties for 18th November, 1971, and the case was adjourned to 31st December, 1971 for the evidence of the parties. On the date fixed the representative of the workman has made a statement that the workman has not contacted him and he has no instruction from the workman.

In view of the statement, I hold that the termination of the services of the workman was justified and he is not entitled to any relief I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Dated the 31st December, 1971.

No. 10, dated Rohtak, the 3rd January, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 454-4Lab-72/2009.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Universal Victory Bus Service (P) Ltd., Ambala City.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 42 of 1970

between

THE WORKMAN SHRI NAND KISHORE AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S UNIVERSAL VICTORY BUS SERVICE (P) LTD., AMBALA CITY

Present :

Shri Madhu Sudan Sharan Cowshish, for the workman.

Shri R. L. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute was referred to the Labour Court, Faridabad for adjudication.—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/UMB/87-A-68, dated the 3rd February, 1969:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Nand Kishores son of L. Mukandi Lal was justified and in order, if not, to what relief is he entitled?

After the constitution of this Court the dispute was referred for adjudication to this Court,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. 6091-E-Lab-70/22387 dated the 31st July, 1970 but it is not necessary to decide the case on merits because the representative of the workman has stated that the workman concerned has since died. So the dispute has abated. I give my award accordingly.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated the 23rd December, 1971

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2 dated the 3rd January, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 442-4Lab-72/2011.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Municipal Committee, Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 47 of 1970

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE,
JAGADHRI

Present:—

Shri Madhu Sudan Sharan Cowlish, for the workmen.

Shri Subhash Chander, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute between the workmen and the management of Municipal Committee, Jagadhri was referred to the Labour Court, Faridabad for adjudication,—*vide Gazette Notification No. ID/UMB/12-67, dated the 8th May, 1969:—*

“Whether the termination of services of the following workers were justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

1. Shri Om Parkash, son of Shri Itwari Ram.
2. Shri Shiv Charan, son of Shri Muna Ram.
3. Shri Inder Raj, son of Shri Chanwa Ram.
4. Shri Om Parkash, son of Shri Atma Ram.
5. Shri Som Dutt, son of Shri Biroo Ram.

After the constitution of this Court the dispute was referred for adjudication to this Court,—*vide Gazette Notification No. 6091-E-Lab-70/22387, dated the 31st July, 1970* but it is not necessary to decide the case on merits because the representative of the workmen has made a statement that all the workmen have taken back into service and now no dispute with the respondent Committee. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

dated the 3rd January, 1972.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No 12, dated Rohtak, the 3rd January, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

—
B. L. AHUJA,

Commissioner for Labour & Employment and Secy.